



Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

042390.P10450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on June 26, 2006

Signature _____

Typed or printed name Tu Nguyen

Application Number

09/822,735

Filed

03/30/2001

First Named Inventor

Jiming Sun

Art Unit

2144

Examiner

Michael Delgado

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐

applicant/inventor.

☐

assignee of record of the entire interest.

See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)

☒

attorney or agent of record.

Registration number 42,034☐

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____

Thanh V. Nguyen

Typed or printed name

(714) 557-3800

Telephone number

June 26, 2006

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

☐


*Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Appl. No. 09/822,735

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application. No. : 09/822,735
Applicant : Jiming Sun
Filed : 03/30/2001
TC/A.U. : 2144
Examiner : Michael A. Delgado

Confirmation No. 7299

Docket No. : 042390.P10450
Customer No. : 8791

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Sir:

In response to the Final Office action dated March 27, 2006, Applicant would like to request a pre-appeal panel review of the application.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 2 of this paper.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application.

This request is in response to the Final Office Action mailed March 27, 2006. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and contend that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of indefiniteness and/or anticipation.

Pre-appeal panel review of the application in light of the remarks/arguments made herein is respectfully requested.

There are several clear errors in the Examiner's rejections and arguments.

1) Chatterjee 1, Chatterjee 2, Ludwig, and Miller, taken alone or in any combination, do not disclose or suggest a management layer to process data in a first format using a processing function that is enabled or disabled by a configuration user interface.

Applicants refer to the response filed on January 9, 2006, page 9. Among other things, Applicants contend that the Examiner failed to identify the management layer and/or the configuration user interface in any one of Chatterjee 1, Chatterjee 2, Ludwig, and Miller.

2) Chatterjee 1, Chatterjee 2, Ludwig, and Miller, taken alone or in any combination, do not disclose or suggest a packetizer to packetize the string of data into at least one packet having a header identifying the first format.

Applicants refer to the response filed on January 9, 2006, page 9. Among other things, Applicants contend that (a) Chatterjee 1 merely discloses formatting, compressing, and encoding, not packetizing, (b) Chatterjee 1 merely discloses producing the header during compressing (before encoding), not during packetizing (after encoding), (c) Chatterjee 1 does not disclose that the header identifying the first format, and (d) Chatterjee 2 does not disclose two different formats.

3) Chatterjee 1, Chatterjee 2, Ludwig, and Miller, taken alone or in any combination, do not disclose or suggest a detector to detect the second format.

Applicants refer to the response filed on January 9, 2006, page 9. Among other things, Applicants contend that Chatterjee 1 merely discloses checking for a place keeper/end of message character, not detecting second format.

4) Ludwig does not disclose or suggest encoding data into a string of data:

Applicants refer to the response filed on January 9, 2006, page 9. Among other things, Applicants contend that Ludwig merely discloses the PPP is used to transport multiple protocols for packet transmission, not used for encoding data.

5) Miller does not disclose or suggest supporting multiple formats:

Applicants refer to the response filed on January 9, 2006, page 9. Among other things, Applicants contend that Miller merely discloses decoding and decompression, which are opposites of encoding.

6) Modifying Chatterjee 1 to incorporate Herbert would render Chatterjee 1's invention being unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

Applicants refer to the response filed on January 9, 2006, pages 10-11. Among other things, Applicants contend that modifying Chatterjee 1 to incorporate Herbert implies that the message must be encoded by high-order derivatives which are incompatible with ASCII text message.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Review Panel render a decision allowing the application.

Conclusion


Applicant respectfully requests the Review Panel render a decision allowing the application.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: June 26, 2006

By


Thinh V. Nguyen

Reg. No. 42,034

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:


MAILING

FACSIMILE

☒ *deposited with the United States Postal Service
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.*

☐ *transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and
Trademark Office.*

Date: June 26, 2006


Tu Nguyen

June 26, 2006

Date